

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 3, 2006. Claims 1 and 4 to 9 are in the application, with Claim 9 having been newly added herein. Claims 1 and 5 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4 to 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Although the Office Action rejects the claims under the enablement requirement, Applicants believe the rejection is directed to the written description requirement, since the Office Action asserts that “no teaching is found in the specification” of the slave device issuing a switch request or that connections between the slave and master are made independently. (Office Action, page 2). In this regard, Applicants have responded based on Applicants’ best understanding of the rejections. If the Examiner intended to enter an enablement rejection, Applicants note that the rejection is improper since it fails to provide factors, reasons, and evidence to support the burden required by MPEP § 2164.04.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, are respectfully traversed since the claims are clearly supported by the specification. For example, page 9, lines 19 to 27 and page 15, lines 24 to 26 of the specification clearly disclose that the slave issues a switch request. Moreover, amendments to the claims are believed to obviate the rejections. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4 to 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Amendments to the claims are believed to obviate the rejections. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4 to 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over European Patent Application EP 0752667 (Van Loo) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,247,101 (Settles). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, independent Claim 1 defines a bus control method for a bus, which is provided with a switch having a plurality of master ports for connecting a plurality of masters and a plurality of slave ports for connecting a plurality of slaves. The switch can connect each of the plurality of masters to an arbitrary one of the plurality of slaves. The method comprises a read command transaction step in which a master initiates a read transaction with a switch request for connecting with a slave, the switch establishes a connection between the master and the slave, the master issues an address and a command, and the switch releases the connection before read return data is issued from the slave. The method also comprises a read data transaction step in which the slave issues a switch request for connecting with the master after the connection is released in the read command transaction step, the switch establishes a connection between the slave and the master independent from the connection made in the read command transaction step, and the slave issues read return data. Before the read data transaction step is completed, a read command transaction step of a next read transaction can be issued.

Independent Claim 5 defines a bus system comprising a plurality of masters, a plurality of slaves, and a bus that is provided with a switch. The switch can connect each of the plurality of masters and an arbitrary one of the plurality of slaves in a read transaction which includes a read command transaction and a read data transaction. In the read command transaction, a master initiates the read transaction with a switch request for connecting with a slave, the switch establishes a connection between the master and the

slave, the master issues an address and a command, and the switch releases the connection before read return data is issued from the slave. In the read data transaction, the slave issues a switch request for connecting with the master after the connection is released in the read command transaction, the switch establishes a connection between the slave and the master independent from the connection made in the read command transaction, and the slave issues read return data. Before the read data transaction step is completed, a read command transaction step of a next read transaction can be issued.

The applied references are not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 1 and 5, and in particular, are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of a read command transaction in which a master initiates a read transaction with a switch request for connecting with a slave, a switch establishes a connection between the master and the slave, the switch releases the connection before read return data is issued from the slave, the slave issues a switch request for connecting with the master after the connection is released, the switch establishes a connection between the slave and the master independent from the connection made in the read command transaction, and the slave issues read return data.

Van Loo is seen to disclose a system in which masters M1-M3 and slaves S1-S2 can be connected via data path crossbar 92. While Van Loo's master may issue multiple requests to a slave (See Van Loo, Fig.1A, Fig.3A, Fig.3B, col. 7, line 49 to col. 8, line 24, col 14, lines 41 to 56, and col. 15, line 52 to col. 16, line 19), Van Loo is not seen to disclose or to suggest a read command transaction in which a master initiates a read transaction with a switch request for connecting with a slave, a switch establishes a connection between the master and the slave, the switch releases the connection before

read return data is issued from the slave, the slave issues a switch request for connecting with the master after the connection is released, the switch establishes a connection between the slave and the master independent from the connection made in the read command transaction, and the slave issues read return data.

The remaining applied reference, namely Settles, is not seen to cure the deficiencies of Van Loo, either alone or in any permissible combination. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 5 are believed to be allowable.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'E. Kmett', is written over a horizontal line.

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 116636v1